

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN SUPPORT OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

HON. BOB RILEY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Balanced Budget Amendment.

For too many years Congress has made broken promises and halfhearted attempts to balance the Federal budget. With a national debt in excess of \$5 trillion, we cannot wait another day.

I am committed to enacting a Balanced Budget Amendment for the sake of our children and their future.

My message is simple, the Federal Government must learn to exercise the same fiscal restraints that families and businesses operate under each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, the Balanced Budget Amendment is the only way to guarantee that the Federal deficit will continue on a downward path to zero.

The real victor in the balanced budget debate is the American family. A balanced budget would result in an enormous savings for working Americans.

A balanced budget is not about numbers, its about people and families. Most importantly, its about our moral obligation to stop robbing future generations of the opportunities and prosperity they deserve.

It is irresponsible for us to keep passing our burdens onto our children. The time has come for Congress to represent the will of the people and take responsibility for balancing our Federal budget.

I urge my colleagues to support enactment of the Balanced Budget Amendment.

THE PRESIDENT IS CORRECT—NOW IS THE TIME TO APPROVE THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, for at least two decades, Republican and Democratic administrations have worked to develop an international convention that will ban the production of chemical weapons and establish an international control regime to make it more difficult to produce these horrible weapons of mass destruction.

Shortly after I became the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in early 1993, President Clinton and Secretary of State Christopher submitted the Chemical Weapons Convention to the Senate for ratification. Since legislation to implement the con-

vention requires the approval of both House of Congress, officials of the administration briefed me and members of my subcommittee on its provisions and the legislation necessary to implement that agreement.

This is truly an agreement with broad bipartisan consensus. International negotiations were begun on this agreement during the Reagan administration. The complex negotiations were continued and then completed during the Bush administration. It was the Clinton administration which conducted the final review of the agreement and then submitted the completed agreement to the Senate for ratification, and completed final drafting of the implementing legislation which it then submitted to the House and Senate for adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the convention and the implementing legislation have been before the Congress now for almost 4 years. The time has come for ratification of the agreement and the adoption of legislation to implement it. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we move to complete this important international convention. The international agreement and the implementing legislation were worked out with the strong support and in close consultation with chemical manufacturers in the United States. The industry understands that it has a very strong interest in the adoption of the convention and the implementing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues in the other body to act responsibly, to move quickly and decisively to ratify this important agreement, and I urge my colleagues in this House to move quickly to adopt the implementing legislation. The requisite number of countries have already ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention—it will go into effect with or without the participation of the United States in April of this year. As President Clinton said in his excellent State of the Union Address earlier this week, it is essential that the United States ratify this agreement before it goes into effect so that we will be full and active participants in establishing the international system that will be responsible for enforcing the convention.

It is unfortunate when politics gets in the way of good policy, and I fear that this may be happening in the other body. There is broad bipartisan support and broad expert agreement upon the merits of this agreement. In this regard, I call to the attention of my colleagues an opinion article on the Chemical Weapons Convention that appeared in the Washington Post, January 6, 1997 by retired Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, Jr., the former Chief of Naval Operations, 1970–74. Mr. Speaker I ask that Admiral Zumwalt's article be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give it careful and thoughtful attention. Admiral Zumwalt, who has always had the security interests of the United States as the highest priority, makes an exceptionally strong case for quick approval of the convention.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1997]

A NEEDLESS RISK FOR U.S. TROOPS

(By E.R. Zumwalt, Jr.)

It has been more than 80 years since poison gas was first used in modern warfare—in

April 1915 during the first year of World War I. It is long past time to do something about such weapons.

I am not a dove. As a young naval officer in 1945, I supported the use of nuclear weapons against Japan. As chief of naval operations two decades ago, I pressed for substantially higher military spending than the nation's political leadership was willing to grant. After retiring from the Navy, I helped lead the opposition to the SALT II treaty because I was convinced it would give the Soviet Union a strategic advantage.

Now the Senate is considering whether to approve the Chemical Weapons Convention. This is a worldwide treaty, negotiated by the Reagan administration and signed by the Bush administration. It bans the development, production, possession, transfer and use of chemical weapons. Senate opposition to ratification is led by some with whom I often agree. But in this case, I believe they do a grave disservice to America's men and women in uniform.

To a Third World leader indifferent to the health of his own troops and seeking to cause large-scale pain and death for its own sake, chemical weapons have a certain attraction. They don't require the advanced technology needed to build nuclear weapons. Nor do they require the educated populace needed to create a modern conventional military. But they cannot give an inferior force a war-winning capability. In the Persian Gulf war, the threat of our uncompromising retaliation with conventional weapons deterred Saddam Hussein from using his chemical arsenal against us.

Next time, our adversary may be more berserk than Saddam, and deterrence may fail. If that happens, our retaliation will be decisive, devastating—and no help to the young American men and women coming home dead or bearing grievous chemical injuries. What will help is a treaty removing huge quantities of chemical weapons that could otherwise be used against us.

Militarily, this treaty will make us stronger. During the Bush administration, our nation's military and political leadership decided to retire our chemical weapons. This wise move was not made because of treaties. Rather, it was based on the fact that chemical weapons are not useful for us.

Politically and diplomatically, the barriers against their use by a First World country are massive. Militarily, they are risky and unpredictable to use, difficult and dangerous to store. They serve no purpose that can't be met by our overwhelming conventional forces.

So the United States has no deployed chemical weapons today and will have none in the future. But the same is not true of our potential adversaries. More than a score of nations now seek or possess chemical weapons. Some are rogue states with which we may some day clash.

This treaty is entirely about eliminating other people's weapons—weapons that may some day be used against Americans. For the American military, U.S. ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention is high gain and low or no pain. In that light, I find it astonishing that any American opposes ratification.

Opponents argue that the treaty isn't perfect: Verification isn't absolute, forms must be filled out, not every nation will join at

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.